A

DEMONSTRATION

OF THE

NECESSITY

OF A

Legiſlative Union of Great Britain and Ireland,

INVOLVING

A REFUTATION OF EVERY ARGUMENT WHICH HAS BEEN OR CAN BE URGED

AGAINST

THAT MEASURE.

BY A PHILOSOPHER.

Felix, qui potuit rerum cognoſcere cauſas.

—DUBLIN:—

PRINTED AND SOLD BY THE BOOK-SELLERS.

1799

BRITISH MUSEUM
17
53
SEP

A

DEMONSTRATION, &c.

WHEN the recluſe moraliſt contemplates in his cloſet the powers and affections of man, what a flattering picture of the perfection of human nature, may not his fond ſpeculations paint! In delineating the comprehenſive draught he may even riot in the enthuſiaſm of imagination, and the ſevere deductions of reaſon will almoſt confirm the warm colouring of fancy. But if, quitting the calm retirement of ſtudy, he views on the buſy theatre of life the hero of his abſtract reſearch, how ſhall he recognize that being, whoſe perfections he has traced with ſuch ſelf-complacency and triumph! Should we ſuppoſe him capable of obſerving without mixing in the crowd, it might coſt him many an anxious moment of painful inveſtigation to explain the melancholy contraſt. But, does he himſelf make one of the motley multitude, his doubts may vaniſh, and his wonder ceaſe, he may relinquiſh, perhaps

with a ſigh, the ideal object of philoſophic enquiry, and exhibit in himſelf the meaneſt ſlave of prejudice and paſſion. The various queſtions in religion, in morals, in politics, which have agitated, perplexed and inflamed mankind, and which in this refined age of ſcience and of arts, diſtract and deſolate the moſt civilized portion of the earth, exhibit humiliating proof of the malignity of the human heart, and the perverſion of human intellect. Sophiſtry and bigotry, and ſuperſtition, and fanaticiſm, and ambition, and tyranny, ſtill triumph on the ruins of reaſon and humanity. But amidſt the barbariſm and convulſions of ſociety produced by the depravity of man, amidſt the ravages of the ſword and of the pen, ſome ſuperior minds have always ſoared above the morbid maſs of human vice and folly, and if they have not been able to enlighten and reform the brutes around them, they have at leaſt in themſelves vindicated the ways of providence in the creation of man. Philoſophy follows at a diſtance the footſteps of prieſtcraft and ambition, and ſtrives to heal the wounds which they inflict. But while thouſands have uſurped, few indeed have deſerved the ſublime diſtinction, and honourable title of philoſopher. The true philoſopher muſt poſſeſs an underſtanding clear and comprehenſive, and a heart pure and beneyolent. Eagle-eyed ſagacity, quick perception, nice diſcernment, ſolid judgment, vigorous comprehenſion, ſtrong memory, a mind at once analytical, and ſynthetical, erudition, various

and

and extenſive and yet neither imprinting prejudice nor ſyſtem, a heart untainted by vice, unſwayed by paſſion, candour, moderation and humanity, theſe are a few of the qualifications eſſentially requiſite to form the genuine philoſopher; to form the man, who may, without the charge of preſumption, attempt to diſcuſs any queſtion of importance to the intereſts of mankind. He muſt ſee effects in the womb of their cauſes, and muſt trace the concatenation of human affairs with undeviating rectitude of head and heart. A few ſimple yet comprehenſive principles once diſcovered, and a few ſtrong, leading facts once aſcertained, will enable the philoſopher to deduce a multitude of remote propoſitions, and to propheſy a multitude of diſtant events. With a few ſuch materials he will reſolve the moſt perplexing doubts in phyſics and morals, and predict the revolutions, which muſt convulſe the nations of the earth. He will demonſtrate the combinations and reſolutions, which political aſſociations muſt internally undergo, and the external and reciprocal relations, which they muſt exhibit. Thus qualified I have thought proper to communicate to a benighted people the unerring deciſions of philoſophy, the radiant illuminations of truth, or a ſubject, which ſeems at preſent to agitate ſelf-intereſt, amaze ignorance, and perplex ſtupidity. And I do this partly for the ſake of reforming others, and partly for the ſelf-gratification of ſhewing my intellectual pre-eminence. For I do not deem it inconſiſtent with philoſophy to purſue my own

pleaſure,

pleaſure, when I do not thereby debaſe my nature, nor injure my fellow-creatures. And ſurely the ſimply foretelling of what philoſophic ſagacity perceives to be inevitable cannot impede, though it may not promote the intereſts of mankind. To individuals indeed the fore knowledge of appropriate evil is preſent miſery; but, evils, which affect the maſs, the downfall of empires, excite not perſonal intereſt; confident in his own peculiar good fortune, each man allots to his neighbour a portion of the common ruin, and exults in his own immunity.

The queſtion which now occupies, or ſeems to occupy the public attention in this miſerable little iſland, this ſpeck upon the globe, is what I wiſh to ſet at reſt, and conſign to that repoſe, which Philoſophy prepares for the perplexities of man. Will an UNION between Great Britain and Ireland be beneficial or injurious to Ireland? What is meant by this Union it is ſurely unneceſſary to define; that about which all employ their thoughts, their tongues, or their pens, all muſt underſtand. Philoſophy is not ſo arrogant as to ſuppoſe men ignorant of the very language, which they invent, it only preſumes to unfold thoſe eternal eſſences, and relations of things, which are altogether independent of human invention, and human reaſon; which may be diſcovered, but cannot be controuled by finite intelligence. Will an Union of Great Britain and Ireland be beneficial or injurious to Ireland? Now, I do pronounce this to be as idle an enquiry as ever conſumed the moſt precious of all things—time. For

I do

I do pronounce this ſame Union to be as inevitable as any conſequence that ever flowed from determinore, adequate, moral cauſes; and to depend as little upon the ſolution of the queſtion, whether it will or will not be beneficial to Ireland, as the death of Socrates did upon the ſolution of the queſtion, whether the hemlock which cauſed it, was good or bad for his conſtitution. The life and conduct of Socrates in the times in which he lived, and among the men who were his judges, unavoidably produced his condemnation and death; and the chymical properties of the plant, which furniſhed the poiſon, only ſupplied the place of ſome other inſtrument of ſtupidity or malice. For any effect it could have had in reſcuing Socrates from the execution of his ſentence, the people of Athens might have been juſt as wiſely employed in analyzing theſe properties, as the people of Ireland are at this day in analyzing the properties of an Union, for any effect it can have on the final accompliſhment of that event. The death of Socrates of old was an event in philoſophic contemplation, altogether independent of the chimical analyſis of cicuta; and the Union, when it happens, will be an event in the ſame contemplation, eſſentially independent of all political analyſis of the ingredients, which may compoſe it. The remote determining cauſes of the one event and of the other, are equally unconnected with, and uninfluenced by, ſuch idle diſquiſitions.

Another

Another queſtion, in the eye of Philoſophy as immaterial as the former, has been ſtarted on this ſubject. Has the Iriſh Parliament a right to agree to this Union? And ſome very clear, but every unimportant propoſitions, with reſpect to its incompetency, have been ſtated and enforced. Now this enquiry is juſt as nugatory, and inapplicable to any uſeful purpoſe as the former. The cauſes which will eſſentially produce an Union, exiſted before ever an Iriſh Parliament had exiſtence, and the competency or incompetency of that Parliament can no more affect the influence of theſe cauſes, than the dog, who bays the moon, can affect its influence on the ebbing and flowing of our ſea.

The laws of matter irreſiſtibly determine the tides of the ocean; and events happened centuries ago, which as irreſiſtibly in their neceſſary conſequences will effect the Union of Great Britain and Ireland in Legiſlative combination. Events happened centuries ago, which in their unavoidable tendencies have made Ireland a dependent acceſſary to Great Britain, finally to be undiſtinguiſhed in the myſtic legiſlative unity of the whole empire: events, which will annihilate the phyſical repugnancies of Nature, and make the ſea as dry land; events few and ſimple, which, while they eſcape the obſervation of the ſhort-ſighted Vulgar, the Philoſopher marks with piercing ken, and eaſily purſues thro' their remoteſt influences.

When

When in theſe latter days, I have heard men luxuriantly expatiate on the advantages of Ireland, her geographical poſition, her inſular ſtrength, her temperate climate, her fruitful ſoil, her hardy peaſantry, her numerous bays and harbours, ſafe and commodious, opening their capacious boſoms to the Atlantic, and inviting the commerce of the world, her mines, her rivers, her lakes, her canals, her corn fields, her flocks, her herds, as proofs at once of independent ſtructure, and as incentives to follow the loud and imperative call of Nature, I have admired the eloquence, but I have ſmiled at the deluſion. On the face of Ireland Nature with a bold hand has traced the outlines of independence, and had Ireland remained morally as ſhe is phyſically inſulated, Ireland would, no doubt, at this day, be what the warmeſt fancy could paint, or the fondeſt heart deſire. But from the moment the firſt Engliſh adventurer landed in Ireland, the apparent deſtiny of Nature was reverſed, and war, and carnage, and civil ſtrife, and religious diſſenſion, and brutal manners, and brutal vices, barbariſm and beggary, and dependence, became the inevitable lot of Ireland.

What! could all theſe dreadful conſequences follow from this ſingle cauſe? Was not Ireland, at the very time of this invaſion, barbarous in her manners, and diſtracted in her political inſtitutions, a prey to domeſtic contentions, and ſavage crimes? Ireland was then what moſt nations in their early ſtages of civilization have been,—the

theatre of rude virtues and of rude vices. Ireland was then what England had been at a similar ſtage of ſocial exiſtence. But the invaſion of Henry the Second arreſted, by its neceſſary effects, the natural progreſs of civilization, which Ireland would otherwiſe have ſhared in common with England herſelf, as well from the natural courſe of things, as from her peculiar commercial capabilities inviting the intercourſe of the moſt civilized nations. But was not England herſelf the victim of foreign invaſion, and brutal conqueſt, yet England is at this day a great and independent nation? The preſent degraded ſtate of Ireland then has not neceſſarily followed from invaſion and conqueſt, but muſt be attributed to other cauſes inherent in the nature of her people. To this I anſwer, every fact muſt be conſidered under all its circumſtances, and when thus conſidered, no two facts will ever be found preciſely ſimilar. When Rome, at that time all powerful, whoſe object was univerſal dominion, invaded and conquered Britain, Britain was reduced to the ſtate of a ſubject province. This was the natural conſequence of weakneſs contending with inſatiable ambition ſupported by ſuperior ſtrength. But, when upon the diſmemberment of the Roman empire, Britain was left to herſelf, no ſubſequent invaſion of that iſland terminated in conqueſt properly ſo called. The invaders were often ſucceſsful, but their ſucceſs did not ſubject the country, which they invaded, to the countries from which they came. It only procured them a permanent

manent ſettlement, and final incorporation with the natives. Britain, really poſſeſſing more natural advantages and more permanent ſources of greatneſs than the countries of theſe invaders, though accidental cauſes of debility invited their rapacity or ambition, and ſecured their ſucceſs, yet by her manifeſt ſuperiority ſoon converted the invader into the citizen, conſcious of her pre-eminence, and zealous to ſupport it. When William of Normandy invaded England, he aſpired to the throne of an independent nation, and obtained it, partly by treaty, and partly by force. But no conqueſt, however compleat at the firſt, could ever have converted England into a provincial dependency of Normandy. The firſt William had too much ſagacity not to perceive, that the title of King of England was far ſuperior to that of Duke of Normandy. And all his policy in his new kingdom, in the introduction of the feudal ſyſtem, was only to render more powerful, and deſpotic, the ſovereign of an independent iſland. The invader and the invaded, the Saxon and the Norman, became blended in the common maſs of ſubjects, with the common intereſts and the common feelings of Engliſhmen. But when the relative ſituation of England and Ireland, at the time England invaded the latter, is conſidered—England ſtrong in her ſuperior policy, in the unity of her government, in her military inſtitutions,—Ireland weak in the multitude of her petty ſovereignties, and domeſtic feuds, in her civil combinations, and her mili-

tary attainments—the conqueſt of Ireland was inevitable. And when the character of a proud, ſelfiſh, ungenerous, jealous, commercial, military, feudal nation, on the one hand, and that of a turbulent but divided people, naturally rivals of the former in commercial capacities, on the other hand, is conſidered, that conqueſt muſt have been neceſſarily calamitous to Ireland. From the relative ſituation of the two countries, it neceſſarily became a conqueſt peculiarly calamitous, inaſmuch as it produced provincial ſubjection without at the ſame time producing provincial peace and civilization. When ancient Rome had reduced any people from the ſtate of a nation to that of a province, by annihilating all power of effectual reſiſtance to her ſtupendous ſtrength, ſhe conſidered the province no longer as a rival, but as a ſubject ſtate, altogether incapable of reſuming an independent ſtation; therefore, with a policy flowing from her greatneſs, and enlarged views of dominion, ſhe introduced into the provinces her laws, her manners, and her arts. The ravages of her armies were ſucceeded by the wiſdom of her inſtitutions, and the monuments of her artiſts. Hence, though the provinces were oppreſſed by exactions, they were not torn by civil and religious feuds, they were not a prey at once to the crimes of civilized ſociety, and of rude and ſavage barbariſm. As the hiſtorian remarks, "the gentle, but powerful "influence of laws and manners, had gradually "cemented the union of the provinces. Their peaceful

" peaceful inhabitants enjoyed and abuſed the advantages of wealth and luxury." But England, ſufficiently ſtrong to annihilate national independence, but not altogether to ſink the rival in the ſubject, her views being partly directed to military glory and partly to commercial aggrandizement, partook of the ferocity of the one, and the ſelfiſhneſs of the other. She poſſeſſed the luſt of dominion without that grand unity of deſign, which a ſimple plan of univerſal dominion produced in ancient Rome: becauſe, from her inſular ſituation, ſhe is fitted only for commercial purſuits. When England invaded Ireland, though ſufficiently powerful to devaſtate, ſhe neither poſſeſſed the reſources nor the armies, to produce general and peaceful ſubjection; and through all the ſubſequent wars, which fill the bloody annals of Iriſh hiſtory, we obſerve neither the ſplendor of conqueſt, nor the liberal plan of an enlightened commercial policy. I have heard men declaim on the true intereſts of England, and gravely inſiſt that it would be the true intereſt of England to purſue a different line of conduct towards Ireland; that it would be the true intereſt of England that Ireland were really independent, and that the two countries were connected only by the ties of reciprocal advantage, and mutual affection. If ſuch men will point out a ſingle inſtance in the hiſtory of the world, of a nation ſuch as England purſuing its true intereſt, I then will grant that the landing of Fitz-Stephen in Ireland was not neceſſarily productive of all the calamities

calamities of Ireland. But until that inſtance is produced I muſt be allowed to call the men, who thus declaim, ſhallow rhetoricians, and to dignify myſelf with the title of philoſopher, who takes things as nature has made them, conſiders men as they are, not as they ought to be, and thus traces the remoteſt conſequences to their primary efficient cauſes.

The ſuperior power of England at the time of the ſecond Henry, with her ſubſequent policy flowing from the general vices of man, and the peculiar vices of her political and commercial economy, has unavoidably produced the degradation of Ireland, and will ultimately effect the legiſlative Union of the two countries as neceſſarily as the properties of a triangle flow from its figure. Mr. Locke ſays, that moral truth is capable of ſtrict demonſtration, I ſay ſo too, and before I have done I will prove experimentally to the ſatisfaction of the dulleſt apprehenſion the juſtneſs of that opinion. I am ſurpriſed that Mr. Locke, who was a philoſopher of the higheſt order, made ſuch a fuſs and parade about ſo very obvious a propoſition; and I am ſtill more ſurpriſed, that as he thought illuſtration neceſſary, he did not ſelect the very inſtance of the connexion between Great Britain and Ireland, and its unavoidable termination, as moſt happily illuſtrative of what he ſo anxiouſly laboured to eſtabliſh. Thus—Ireland an iſland bleſſed with more natural advantages than England alſo an iſland, a next door neighbour, from accidental cauſes divided, and inviting invaſion——England invades

War

War—Deſolation—Subjection—Diſcontent—Rebellion—Re-ſubjection, with a ſyſtem of confiſcation and diſunion civil and religious—Weakneſs—Provincial Dependence——By this chain of ideas, thus viſibly linked together in train, that is, each intermediate idea agreeing on each ſide with thoſe two it is immediately placed between, the idea of an iſland bleſſed with more natural advantages than England, but from vicinity and weakneſs inviting invaſion, and the idea of provincial dependence, appear to be connected as intimately and eſſentially as the firſt and laſt terms in any ſeries of mathematical demonſtration can poſſibly be. Let us continue the ſeries ſtill further——from provincial dependence follow—Ignorance—Barbariſm—Crimes—the triumph of the wicked and the diſmay of the good—an incorporate Union of the Legiſlatures of Great Britain and Ireland. Now I aſk, whether the connexion between the extremes in this concatenation of ideas is not clear, and whether the Union of Legiſlatures does not neceſſarily flow from the natural advantages of Ireland—from her geographical poſition, her inſular ſtrength, her temperate climate, her fruitful ſoil, her hardy peaſantry, her numerous and capacious and commodious bays and harbours; her rivers, her mines, her lakes, her flocks, her herds, and all the other proofs of her independent ſtructure? It is ſtrange what very different concluſions the vulgar and philoſophic mind will draw from the ſame propoſition:—the wild Iriſhman, from the acknowledged truth that Ireland poſſeſſes more natural advantages than England, with all the raſh-

neſs

neſs of uncultivated reaſon concludes, that Ireland muſt be independent; whereas the philoſopher perceives that, from this very circumſtance of the exuberant bounty of nature towards her, has unavoidably ariſen the dependence of this blundering country.*

In the foregoing demonſtration, an incorporate Union of Britiſh and Iriſh Legiſlatures is proved to be eſſentially involved in the natural progreſs of things; it will follow immediately from the triumph of vice and the conſternation of virtue; but remotely and primarily from the relative ſituation of the countries, originally inviting the rapacity of invaſion, and in the advancement of Britiſh ſpeculation, provoking the jealouſy of narrow policy, awakening and ſtrengthening the malignity of national pride and commercial monopoly. It may be objected, perhaps, by inconſequential reaſoners, that in the above ſeries of concatenated events, that of provincial dependence is miſplaced, for that provincial dependence cannot precede, though it may follow the legiſlative incorporation of the countries: and that, ſince in point of fact Ireland enjoys an independent Parliament, Ireland never can be a province until her independent Parliament becomes merged in Legiſlative Union. Now here appears the ſuperiority of philoſophic over common ratiocination.

* "Le deſpotiſme ecraſe de ſon ſceptre de fer le plus "beau pays du monde: il ſemble que les malheurs des "hommes croiſſent en proportion des efforts que la nature fait pour les rendre heureux." Such is the reflection which Savary makes at the ſight of Egypt. The hiſtory of man has hitherto too fatally juſtified the obſervation. Ø when may we venture to pronounce

Magnus ab integro ſæclorum naſcitur ordo.

nation. Had Ireland indeed an independent Parliament, a Legiſlative Union between Great Britain and Ireland never could take place. The relative ſituation and connection of the countries neceſſarily produced inferiority and dependence on the part of Ireland, and that inferiority and dependence will as neceſſarily produce the Union of Legiſlatures: and to ſay that an independent Parliament could ever be merged in and coaleſce with any other Legiſlative Aſſembly, ſo as thereby from the very nature of the incorporation to loſe all its properties, its powers, and its faculties, is a manifeſt contradiction. An independent national Parliament in its very eſſence contains a principle of individuality and ſeparate exiſtence, and as long as that principle remains, that is, as long as the Parliament is really independent, it is impoſſible it can ever unite with any other Legiſlative Body, which Body muſt from its nature, in the very act of combination, annihilate all the properties of the former. And herein lies the difference between Great Britain and Ireland with reſpect to the Union of Legiſlatures, that the Britiſh Parliament, an independent national Parliament before the Union, will ſtill remain the ſame Being, eſſentially unaffected by that Union. But the very act of Union neceſſarily involves in it the annihilation of the Iriſh Parliament, and therefore were that Parliament really independent it never could be annihilated but by force, it never could conſent to its own deſtruction, becauſe a ſeparate exiſtence

would be a part of its eſſence. It therefore appears evident that the ideas of an independent Iriſh Parliament and of an Union of Britiſh and Iriſh Legiſlatures are incompatible, or in other words that the idea of dependency neceſſarily precedes in the mind the idea of that Union. *Quod erat demonſtrandum.*

Thus then the ideas in the foregoing ſeries follow each other in conſecutive deduction: the relation between the countries from its very nature producing dependence in the weaker, and that dependence ending ultimately in the abſolute and perpetual merger of its Legiſlature. For juſt as in law, when a greater eſtate and a leſs coincide and meet in the ſame perſon, without any intermediate eſtate, the leſs is immediately annihilated; or in legal phraſe, is ſaid to be merged, that is, ſunk or drowned, in the greater; ſo by the coincidence of Britiſh and Iriſh Legiſlatures in the perſon of the Britiſh miniſter, the Iriſh Legiſlature being the leſs will be immediately annihilated, or merged, that is, ſunk or drowned, in the Britiſh. The term for years muſt have a termination by merger in the inheritance, and ſhall never exiſt any more.

Away then with ſuch idle topics as the incompetency of Parliament, and original compacts, and the terms of the Union, and Eaſt India trade, and Weſt India trade, and Channel trade, Rum and Tobacco and Sugar, and Woollens, and Linens, and Cuſtoms and Drawbacks, and Navigation laws, and Britiſh capital, and Dublin ruined, and Cork and Waterford not enriched, and

articles

articles infringed, and where is your ſecurity; and look to Scotland, and her malt tax,* and can one hundred repreſentatives be better than three, and free trade, and ſimple repeal and renunciation, and abſentees, and taxes, and ſtreets grown over with graſs, &c. &c. &c. Every conſideration of the kind has juſt as much relation to the ſubject of an Union as the metaphyſics of hierarchical creeds have to the eternal intereſts of mankind. To the philoſophic mind, though not equally unintelligible, they are equally unimportant. Will any man undertake to demonſtrate that the Engliſh never invaded Ireland—'tis well—he ſpeaks to the purpoſe. But as a negative is generally difficult to be proved, and in the preſent caſe peculiarly ſo, I do not inſiſt that whoever denies my concluſion, ſhould prove my firſt propoſition, with reſpect to the fact of invaſion under all its circumſtances, falſe. No, I am not ſo unreaſonable. But, admitting the fact of invaſion connected with the relative ſituation of England and Ireland, I do boldly challenge the moſt unintelligible metaphyſician, the moſt uncharitable theologian, the moſt corrupt ſtateſman, even Mr. Pitt himſelf, to ſhew that the nature of the connexion between the countries, with all its various modifications and conſequences, has not inevitably followed from that one primary cauſe, and that a more intimate Union, or fuſion, or amalgama of their Legiſlatures muſt not finally take place from the ſame efficient cauſe.

* Crambe repetita, latin for malt tax.

Occidit miſeros crambe repetita magiſtros.

Mr. Pitt has one half of the philoſopher in his compoſition. He wants the heart, but he has the head. And as in logical inference the head alone is concerned, I need not appeal to that, which he does not poſſeſs. Brains, not feelings, are neceſſary in the preſent diſcuſſion. Mr. Pitt's underſtanding is as clear and comprehenſive, as his feelings are obtuſe, and while the preſs is teeming with pamphlets, the offspring of ſelf-intereſt, or of ignorance, or of vanity, or of that moſt inveterate of all diſeaſes, the *cacoethes ſcribendi*, Mr. Pitt with all the keenneſs of philoſophic ſagacity ſees the inevitability of this amalgama of Legiſlatures; and the only doubt, that can ſuggeſt itſelf to his, or any philoſophic head, upon the ſubject is, whether the preciſe moment has arrived when the fuſion will moſt eaſily take place. And this naturally leads me to an enquiry of ſecondary and indeed of very ſubordinate importance, with reſpect to the time, when that Union, which has been demonſtrated to be inevitable, is actually to happen. Now in this enquiry ſtrict demonſtration cannot be had, probable inference can alone be expected. It is by obſerving this diſtinction between the objects of mental reſearch, that true philoſophy avoids all that perplexity, which characteriſes the falſe. Mr. Locke has written a voluminous treatiſe, the profeſſed deſign of which is to aſcertain the bounds between opinion and knowledge, and never was human intellect more uſefully employed. Mr. Locke was a real philoſopher, ſo am I, and there-

fore

fore I do not attempt to give demonſtration where in the nature of things probability alone is to be had, I know the length of my tether, and have found the horizon, which ſets the bounds between the enlightened and dark parts of things. Nor is there any contradiction in being able to prove that an event muſt happen, and yet being ignorant of the time when it is to happen. We may have ſufficient data to demonſtrate the one, and yet be altogether ignorant, or have only probable evidence of the other. Thus, it can be eaſily demonſtrated from the nature of the Deity and of man, that the wicked ſhall be puniſhed in another world, and the good rewarded, and yet we may be abſolutely ignorant of the time when that final diſtribution of juſtice is to take place. Again, it may be demonſtrated, from the ſtructure of the human body, that unleſs ſome miraculous interpoſition ſnatches him from his fate, man muſt one day die, but the preciſe moment when, finite intelligence cannot aſcertain, though in this caſe it may form probable conjectures of the period of diſſolution. Juſt in the ſame manner from the ſtructure of the Iriſh body politic, unleſs ſome interpoſition, ſuperior to the ordinary train of events, arreſts the courſe of nature, the political death of Ireland is demonſtratively certain, while the preciſe moment of her diſſolution is the ſubject of probable calculation alone. *The *ſkillful*

* I have ſaid the *ſkillful* phyſician, therefore let the faculty beware of denying the poſition, which I have laid down,

ful phyſician knows that the ſprings of life muſt one day be worn down, becauſe he has phyſiological data, on which this knowledge is founded, but as ten thouſand cauſes, not eſſentially involved in the nature of the human frame, but purely accidental, may accelerate or retard this event, and indeed as the primary cauſes of death, though eſſentially involved in the nature of that frame, have no diſcoverable quality, which muſt limit their operation to any fixed period, the phyſician can only conjecture, with various degrees of probability, the hour of ſeparation between the periſhable clod, and the immortal ſpirit, by which it is moved and animated. The analogy is complete. There are certain political data, from which the philoſopher can demonſtrate the fall of empires and the diſſolution of ſocieties, but as theſe data do not in themſelves contain any principle, which limits their operation to any certain time, and as the ſubordinate and accidental cauſes, which may accelerate or retard, cannot

down, ſince the denial will not prove the poſition falſe, but only expoſe their own ignorance of nature. I do affirm that it can be clearly demonſtrated from the vital organization of the human body, that it muſt one day be decompoſed, that the aſſimilating organs muſt gradually loſe their tone, and the reabſorbents carry off more from the different parts, than what they receive in the way of nutrition, that the irritable fibre muſt become rigid, the membranes and cartilages oſſify, the bones grow too hard, the ſmaller veſſels collapſe and diſappear, the parts no longer be obedient to the action of ſtimulants, death muſt enſue, and the ſyſtem return to moulder with the duſt.

not be known, or their quantum of energy cannot be demonſtrated, the exact time, when any political change is to take place, can only be conjectured. In the human body there are certain fatal ſymptoms, by which the phyſician can declare that death is not far diſtant; and in ſtates, when the period of diſſolution draws nigh, there are alſo ſymptoms of mortality, which the philoſopher marks, and from which he forms not knowledge, but opinion. And ſome ſuch ſymptoms do at preſent appear in Ireland, which ſeem to mark her for an early grave. Though death is inevitable, it is not therefore palatable. The annihilation of the Iriſh Legiſlature by an incorporate Union with that of Great Britain is as inevitable as death, and may be juſt as unpalatable. The only queſtion therefore with a Britiſh miniſter can be whether at any given time it may be convenient to ſtrike the fatal blow, and the only thing, that now occupies the thoughts of Mr. Pitt, is the ſolution of the problem, whether at this time Ireland would probably expire with much or little ſtruggle, with the feeble groan of univerſal debility, or the convulſive agonies of partial ſtrength. And many reaſons muſt occur to the miniſter, which ſeem to make it highly probable that no more favourable moment than the preſent could be choſen for the deed of death. To enumerate them would be only to detail a black catalogue of horrors, which, while philoſophy deplores, ſhe alſo perceives to have been inevitable.

They

They are neceſſary links in the chain of cauſe and effect. They are the unavoidable conſequences of commercial jealouſy and unfeeling pride, ſupported by ſuperior ſtrength, preying on the weakneſs of a rival. The hiſtory of man has not yet preſented an inſtance where ſuch cauſes have not produced ſimilar effects, where the wantonneſs of power, ſtrong enough to tyranniſe, but not ſufficiently great to be above ſuſpicion or fear, has not trampled on the rights of humanity with the moſt vexatious and afflictive imperiouſneſs. The hiſtory of man never can produce an inſtance of two nations ſimilarly ſituated and ſimilarly related, where the weaker ſhall not ſuffer ſimilar calamities. From the days of Henry the ſecond Ireland has exhibited ſcenes of blood and deſolation, and religious fury, and debilitating diſunion, which were the natural conſequences of a few of the events of that king's reign. And England muſt have been, what no commercial and warlike nation, with the ſame degree of relative ſtrength, ever will be, juſt and merciful, or the connexion muſt have been to Ireland, preciſely what it has been. I have heard much of a plan for uniting Iriſhmen of all religious perſuaſions in the bonds of brotherly affection. I have ſympathiſed in the benevolent wiſh of harmonizing a diſcordant people, but I have pitied the viſionary hope of ſucceſs. I have been aſtoniſhed that men of quick inſight into things, and deep knowledge of human nature, could ever ſeriouſly entertain ſo extravagant a ſcheme, and I could

could only aſcribe the deluſion to that romantic turn of mind, which men of great intellectual powers, but of ſanguine tempers, and ardent fancies, frequently diſplay. Archimedes boaſted that if he had another earth he could remove this, which we inhabit, Archimedes ſpoke like a ſober mathematician, he only required a certain given power to raiſe a given weight: It was a mere queſtion of calculation. But, the connexion between Great Britain and Ireland being given, I defy the ableſt ſtate arithmetician to calculate the power, which would be neceſſary to unite Iriſhmen of all religious perſuaſions in purſuit of their common good: Certainly no finite power can ever accompliſh it. Things having once received a certain conſtitution and certain laws of action, that conſtitution and thoſe laws continuing the ſame, their operation can be altered only by ſome force eſſentially affecting the operative powers themſelves; and therefore, the cauſes which have hitherto produced religious diſunion in Ireland remaining in their full force and vigour, the diſunion itſelf muſt be as permanent, as the cauſes.

In the ſolution of the problem, which alone, as I have ſaid, will engage the attention of the Miniſter on the preſent occaſion, namely the expediency of the preſent time for blending the two Legiſlatures into one, or more properly ſpeaking, for merging, ſinking, or drowning the Iriſh term for years

in the Britiſh fee-ſimple, he may doubtleſs derive much aſſiſtance from the temper and tone of mind with which the propoſition ſeems to be received. With this view the ſubject appears to have been ſtarted by the Miniſter for public diſcuſſion, that is, for diſcuſſion by that very ſmall portion of the people, which can dare to utter any free opinion upon any political queſtion. And the opinion of one body of men, in particular, of this deſcription, ſeems to have been ſtudiouſly courted, or provoked. Of the very few, whoſe public voice can at this time of general diſmay be uttered with ſafety to themſelves, the gentlemen of the Bar are apparently the moſt reſpectable. And, from the ſpirit which they have ſhewn in oppoſition to the propoſed Union, Mr. Pitt may, without much ſhrewdneſs, conjecture what he has to dread from the temper of that part of the nation, which can dare to ſpeak. It would ſeem indeed as if he deſigned to make the Bar the great touchſtone of that temper, by endeavouring to add the active principle of reſentment to thoſe of ſelf-intereſt and patriotiſm, and thus diſcovering the utmoſt ſtrength of the oppoſition, which he has to apprehend. He has therefore told them that their diſapprobation of the Union was taken into his calculation, that he foreſaw, and deſpiſed it, that it would be venal, and therefore could not be formidable. Perhaps a greater inſult never was offered to the feelings of men than has been offered to their's, in a publica-

tion

tion notoriouſly written under the auſpices of the Miniſter. Not to feel and reſent the indignity, would indeed ſanctify the inſolence, from which it flowed. The Miniſter ſeems to have conſidered them as fallen from that proud eminence, on which Nature had placed them, into the diſgraceful obſcurity of vulgar corruption. He ſeems to have conſidered them as ſelf-emaſculated beings, that the form of men remained, but that their ſtrength was gone. Theſe ſurely could not have been his real ſentiments of the Iriſh Bar. He only wiſhed to add the exacerbation of perſonal inſult to the force of patriot feeling, in order to meaſure, on the largeſt ſcale, the reſiſtance of Iriſh loyalty to the meaſure of an Union. What concluſion Mr. Pitt may draw from the tone of the Iriſh Bar, I will not venture to pronounce; but from the complexion of the opinion, which they have publiſhed on the ſubject, I certainly deduce a propoſition directly the contrary of what their opinion enunciates, namely, that this is the very juncture not only to propoſe, but to carry, the meaſure of a Legiſlative Union of this kingdom with Great Britain. With one part of their opinion, however, I agree. This Union will be an innovation, that is, it will be the introduction of ſomething new—innovation, from *in* and *novus*—And, if it introduces Sir B—— R—— into the Britiſh Houſe of Commons, it will undoubtedly introduce a novelty, which the Britiſh Houſe of Commons will very much wonder

to behold. In this ſimple and harmleſs ſenſe I do admit that the Union will be an innovation, it will juſt be an innovation in the ſame ſenſe, that any thing may be ſaid to be an innovation, which happens for the firſt time. But if the gentlemen of the Bar mean to convey an idea by the term innovation, that the Union will be ſomething contrary to firſt principles, ſomething inconſiſtent with the paſt connexion between the countries, I then differ with them in this part of their opinion more widely than in the other. For I do aſſert, and I think I have clearly demonſtrated, that the Union of Legiſlatures will follow from the very nature of that connexion, as neceſſarily as any effect ever happened from an adequate cauſe. Indeed, unleſs the preſent and paſt connexion of the countries is conſidered with relation to, and as directly tending to produce this great effect, it muſt appear the ſtrangeſt anomaly that ever was exhibited in the political ſyſtem, a kind of Zoophyte in politics, a middle being of an amphibious character, * a disjunctive adverſative

* The philological reader will eaſily recogniſe ſome of the language in this deſcription. And why have I adopted it? preciſely for the ſame reaſon that it was originally uſed: becauſe I am attempting to explain what I do not underſtand. What! not underſtand that connexion about which you have written ſo much? The connexion about which I have written I do perfectly underſtand. I have conſidered it as it has exiſted in fact, and not in definition. Viewing it thus, I clearly perceive what it has been, and what it is, and I foreſee what it will end in. But when I ſtrive to conſider this

adverſative conjunction, disjoining with an oppoſition concomitant the intereſts of the two countries, while it is ſuppoſed to conjoin the countries themſelves, preſenting to the mind no fixed palpable idea, which it can graſp and explain, but an homonymous ſomething between connexion and no connexion, having at once the attributes of connexion and no connexion,—a kind of myſterious, ineffable, metaphyſical abſtraction, looſely floating in the brain, without either delighting the fancy, or ſatisfying the underſtanding, having all the indiſtinctneſs, without the imagery of poetical viſion.

But as ſoon as this connexion is conſidered with reſpect to its final and neceſſary termination, it no longer appears an undefinable obſcure term, invented to conceal ignorance of nature in the myſtery of language, but conveys a clear and determinate idea to the mind, and whereas before all was chaos and confuſion, we then inſtantly diſcover order, and harmony, and beauty. We are no longer diſtracted with the jargon of parts ſeparated and

this connexion as repreſented by others, I then freely confeſs I do not underſtand it. When I hear of *imperial independent* Ireland, and her *independent* Parliament, and in the ſame breath of Engliſh influence and Engl ſh councils directing and controuling that *independent* Ireland, and that *independent* Parliament *ad libitum*, and that the connexion between the countries conſiſts in this very coincidence of independence and of influence, I am altogether at a loſs to comprehend ſuch contradiction and myſtery, and cannot help conſidering it as the jargon of ſelf-intereſt or of ignorance.

and yet conjoined, but are pleaſed with the contemplation of one continuous whole.

Ut per læve ſeveros
Effundat junctura ungues.

Indeed on due conſideration it will appear, that the Gentlemen of the Bar themſelves did not underſtand the term innovation in a ſenſe different from the obvious and primary one of the introduction of ſomething new; for they do not declare that a Legiſlative Union of this kingdom and Great Britain would violate any known fixed principles, but on the contrary, they ſeem virtually to admit that it would not, while they merely deprecate it as a novelty, which they would not wiſh to ſee introduced in their own generation. The reſolution publiſhed by the Bar, when viewed in this light, diſcovers ſome philoſophic ſagacity, it ſeems to imply a conviction, that an Union is an event, which muſt ſome time happen, but which may be accelerated or retarded by ſecondary cauſes. And no doubt the Reſolution was intended as a retarding cauſe. In my opinion it will operate as an accelerating cauſe. But this by the by.

But while I have thus demonſtrated the inevitable termination of Britiſh and Iriſh Connexion, in an incorporating Union of Legiſlatures, and offered ſome conjectures with reſpect to the time of that incorporation, I beg I may not be underſtood as attempting to inſinuate that ſuch an event will be beneficial to Ireland. I have only been explaining, as a Philoſopher, the dependency of effects on their

cauſes,

cauſes, and ſhewing that truths founded on certain phyſical and moral relations muſt be as immutable as thoſe relations; that, while the relations remain the ſame, no modification of circumſtances, not affecting the eſſence of the relations, can affect the properties, which flow from that eſſence. I would turn the literary mind from nugatory diſputation about the powers of Parliament, and the legiſlative, commercial, and financial conſequences of the Union, to the only ſubject of diſcuſſion really worthy of employing the philoſophic underſtanding, which delights in the contemplation of abſtract truth, and in tracing effects to their primary cauſes. What though it may be proved, by a laboured induction of particulars, that an Iriſh independent Legiſlature can alone know, and feel, and promote the intereſts of Ireland, and that an Union of Britiſh and Iriſh Legiſlatures muſt annihilate whatever remains of the phyſical and moral ſtrength of Ireland, will that ſhew that ſuch an event will not take place? or can ſuch a detailed inveſtigation of a part afford any pleaſure to the Philoſopher, who ſees the whole at a glance; who, merely from the knowledge of one or two facts laying the foundation of certain relations, can rapidly deduce a long ſeries of conſecutive truths? Can he receive information or delight from a verboſe proof of a ſingle propoſition, which he intuitively perceives to be neceſſarily connected with an antecedent link in a compendious demonſtration? Muſt he not rather

feel

feel ſorrow and humiliation, to ſee the intellectual powers of man waſted and abuſed,—to ſee the divine particle, which ſhould ſoar to Heaven, fixed to the earth,—

(*Atque affigit humo divinæ particulam auræ,*)

to ſee time proſtituted on diſquiſitions, of which the events and the intereſts of time are altogether independent.

But what expoſes the extreme ignorance as well as folly of the champions of what is called Iriſh *independent* Legiſlature, who think by words to arreſt the inevitable deſtiny of a people founded on real eſſences and immutable truths, is, that the very topics, on which they inſiſt as reaſons againſt an Union, are among thoſe minor and ſubordinate cauſes, which, though they could not eſſentially affect an event independent of them, have certainly accelerated the time of its accompliſhment. Such are the apparent benefits to Ireland, which Iriſh Legiſlation ſeems to have produced. * Free Trade, Simple Repeal, Renunciation, have all haſtened the Legiſlative incorporation of the kingdoms; for, though they did not contribute an jota to the real independence of Ireland, they loudly proclaimed the inconvenience and expence of a diſtinct Legiſlature, and its incompatibility

* Upon ſuch an occaſion Sancho Panza might ſay, *muchos van por lana, y buelvan treſquilados*, without incurring the charge of miſapplying his proverbs, ſo often made againſt him by the Knight of the ſorrowful Figure.

patibility with the grand unity and indiviſibility of conſolidated empire. The dramatic unites of time and place are rather the arbitrary dictates of a dogmatiſt, than rules founded in the principles of nature; and Shakeſpeare, who has written in the moſt wanton violation of theſe unities, will exerciſe a magic power over the heart, while it poſſeſſes a ſingle chord, which can vibrate to the touch of genuine paſſion. Not ſo the unity of Government, this is founded in nature, here all the parts muſt conſpire to form one conſiſtent whole, there muſt be no *imperium in imperio*, no independent dependency, no unconnecting connection, one common life muſt pervade every member, one common will muſt direct every muſcle. It is from its direct tendency to produce this happy conſummation, that the Britiſh Conſtitution has become the envy and the admiration of the world; the idol to which the ſublime genius of a Burke bowed down, and which he worſhipped with all the glowing imagery of poetic Gentiliſm. With what ſupreme contempt would this great man and grand penſionary have treated the ſimple panegyriſt of Iriſh independent Parliaments! he would have deſcribed him as one ſhooting in the dark, and therefore liable to perpetual blunders, as one praiſing and cenſuring merely by chance, who, though he might poſſibly to fools appear as a wiſe man, muſt certainly among the wiſe ever paſs for a fool, that his intellect comprehended politics as his eye could comprehend a diſtant proſpect,

pect, he might ſee perhaps enough to know mountains from mole-hills, but for an accurate diſcernment of governments, and their character, this it was impoſſible he ſhould attain.

Some few Iriſh Parliamentary characters have been denominated Patriots, and if merely to mean well to our country conſtitutes the idea of a patriot, perhaps they deſerved the appellation. But they cannot at once deſerve the title of patriots and philoſophers. Did they indeed act from the pure motive of doing good, and not from the corrupt principle of ſacrificing Truth to Ambition, they may have felt the influence of Philoſophy on their hearts, but their intellect could not have been irradiated by its illuminations, or they never would have waſted their time and their talents in aſſerting idle claims of independence, and in trifling diſputation about the reſpective merits of Renunciation and Simple Repeal.

But among all the cauſes, which have influenced the event of an Union, not in its eſſence, but merely in the accidental modification of time, in my mind there is not one, which has contributed ſo powerfully to its acceleration as the vote of the Iriſh Legiſlature on the queſtion of Regency, during his preſent Majeſty's indiſpoſition. Though that vote proceeded not from any romantic principles of Iriſh independence, but from the rational principles of arithmetic, which coldly calculated the chances for and againſt the King's recovery, and conſulted not

Price

Price on civil liberty, but Price on annuities; though it was not the refined paganiſm of antient Rome or of modern France in embodying a mixed mode, and hailing Liberty as a goddeſs, but the obvious and vulgar idolatry of worſhipping the riſing ſun, yet did it demonſtrate, more forcibly than any empty aſſertion of independence by Simple Repeals or Renunciations, the inconvenience and danger of diſtinct Legiſlatures. The famous round Robin wore the appearance of a deſperate conſpiracy, which the tie of ſelf-intereſt and falſe honour, ſubſtituted for the obligations of virtue, rendered more truly formidable to the Britiſh Cabinet, than all the manly eloquence of the argumentative Flood, or all the pointed invective of the epigrammatic Grattan. It experimentally impreſſed on the mind of Mr. Pitt an argument for haſtening the Legiſlative incorporation of the countries, never to be effaced.

As another cauſe accelerating this event may juſtly be reckoned the character of the miniſter himſelf. The ruling paſſion of his ſoul is ambition, or the deſire of power and celebrity, with the moſt ſtoical indifference as to the rectitude of the means of their attainment; and the conſolidation of two kingdoms by an unition of Legiſlatures, the *one and indiviſible*, appears not ill calculated to give eclat to his adminiſtration. With philoſophic acuteneſs he ſees that this conſolidation muſt inevitably happen, and his firſt wiſh will be gratified by the acceſſion of power and of fame, which he muſt

derive from its completion in his own miniſtry. It is true, he may be loaded with curſes by an enſlaved people. But the man, who conſumed the temple of Diana, attained the object of his deſire, every lover of the arts repeats his name with execration. Did hiſtory only regiſter the juſtice and the humanity of ambition, her records would lie in a nut-ſhell.

The Britiſh miniſter has alſo at this time in Ireland the moſt convenient inſtruments of a deadly purpoſe, that a murderous heart could wiſh—cold-blooded aſſaſſins of a nation's rights. There are crimes of an open and daring complexion, which genius and courage reſcue from contempt. Some crimes ravage like a tempeſt, they are ſublime in their deſolation. But in the character of thoſe men, who live by the debaſement of Ireland, by ſacrificing her intereſts and her rights to the malignant jealouſy of a rival, who barter for gold Iriſh liberty, and Iriſh blood, we ſee all the baſeneſs of a depraved mind, without any of the grandeur in which even villainy is ſometimes cloathed. We abhor and we deſpiſe. More convenient panders to ambition nature never formed. More apt and ready inſtruments for completing the work of provincial ſervitude time can never furniſh. Men ſo completely contemned by a nation excite no intereſt in the public mind, and any new inſtance of treachery will be heard without emotion, becauſe public ſcorn is already too intenſe to be increaſed. Theſe men too know that they are deſpiſed, which

muſt

muſt heighten their malignity.* It would ſeem indeed as if the miniſter had purpoſely reduced them to a ſtate of hopeleſs perdition, leſt a chance of pardon might lead to repentance. Or perhaps he thought to increaſe the loathing of the country to ſuch a degree that it would gladly ſwallow any potion, which might enable it to ſpew out ſuch abominable foulneſs. Nay, do we not hear the official advocate for an Union urging the vileneſs of theſe men, as an argument for the meaſure? In the corruptor what matchleſs impudence! In the corrupted what abject depravity!

Various other topics might be urged to ſhew that the event of a Legiſlative Union of Great Britain and Ireland is probably not far diſtant. Though to the ſelf-intereſted of the preſent generation this may be the moſt important enquiry, to the impartial philanthropiſt it is an enquiry of very inferior moment. To demonſtrate that it is an event, which muſt follow from certain fixed and immutable

* Upon a ſimilar principle eunuchs have been conſidered by Eaſtern deſpotiſm as the moſt faithful ſlaves, cut off by the ignominy of their condition from the reſt of ſociety they ſeemed on that account more ſtrongly engaged to an entire attachment to their maſter, on whom their whole fortune depended, and by whoſe means alone it was, that they were of any conſideration. ἄδοξοι ὄντες (ſays Xenophon) οἱ εὐνοῦχοι παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο δεσπότου ἐπικούρου προσδέονται. Theſe deſpicable creatures however were generally found equally enemies to prince and people, their ſole view being to get poſſeſſion of the prince's mind, and to hide affairs as much as poſſible from his knowledge. *Claudentes principem ſuum, et agentes ante omnia ne quid ſciat.*

ble relations, has been my principal deſign. Whether it is an event to be deplored or rejoiced in by Iriſh patriotiſm, or by Iriſh venality, is a queſtion unworthy of Philoſophy, which only ſeeks to diſcover and to apply uſeful truths. And what uſeful purpoſe can it ſerve to tell man, when he ſhould laugh, or when he ſhould mourn? Philoſophy only condeſcends to inveſtigate thoſe eternal verities, which ariſe from the agreement or diſagreement of abſtract ideas. The ſame ideas will eternally have the ſame habitudes and relations, and, when the philoſopher ſhews that any two ideas concerning ſome important intereſt have certain habitudes and relations, he performs a ſervice worthy of ſcience, becauſe uſeful to man. Can it be demonſtrated that vice muſt neceſſarily lead to miſery? Let men be virtuous, if they would be happy. Can it be demonſtrated that every province muſt ſurrender all its attributes, phyſical and moral, to the arbitrary control of the worſt paſſions of the human heart? LET NO COUNTRY SUBMIT TO BE A PROVINCE, WHICH HAS STRENGHTH TO BE A NATION. But to tell a tributary people that it is not pleaſant to pay the exaction, which follows from its relative exiſtence, without pointing out the mode, by which it may be reſcued from extortion, is to wound with inſult, not to illuminate with ſcience.*

Probitas

* The Philoſopher would tell ſuch a people that the true mode of redreſs is not by coldly declaring that it is only obliged to pay a certain tribute, and that the exaction is an *innovation*; but by boldly diſſolving altogether that CONNEXION between the ruling and the ſubject ſtate, from which both the tribute, and the exaction flow.

Probitas laudatur et alget.

We hear encomiums on independence, but not one word how independence is to be obtained. Go, tell the wretched negro, writhing beneath the laſh of the unfeeling planter, how far preferable it would be to roam through the wilds of his native Africa. Go, and then call yourſelf his friend.

O Ireland, Ireland, I have not inſulted miſery by panegyriſing happineſs. I have endeavoured to reconcile you to your fate, by ſhewing that it is an eſſential link in the great chain of human affairs, connecting together cauſe and effect, that it is neceſſary to that unity of will, which ſhould direct every part of the Britiſh empire, and which it muſt be the firſt wiſh of every Britiſh miniſter to effect. That it may not be the wiſh of the true Iriſh heart I can readily conceive. But if it is an evil, the evil that is known to be irremediable may be alleviated by patience. Sweet is the enchantment of hope—but the ſoul is ſickened by hope deferred, and the multiplied pangs of diſappointment impair the energies of life. Sweet is the enchantment of hope—but Philoſophy only ſacrifices at the altar of truth, and cannot cheriſh the deluſions of fancy. And yet Philoſophy does not affect to communicate the ſecret of either not feeling, or of deſpiſing calamity, but teaches men to bear with firmneſs the evils, which cannot be removed. Philoſophy would not torture the hopeleſs ſlave, by teaching him the ideas and the language of freedom. In the man who is doomed to experience the curſe of dependence, the bold

bold ſpirit of expreſſing the feelings of nature without diſguiſe, ought to be ſubdued, from the conſciouſneſs that it cannot be gratified. The emotions of the heart are frequently too ardent for our ſituation, and it muſt be the ſtudy of our lives to conquer or conceal them.

" It is thou, Liberty, thrice ſweet and gracious " Goddeſs, whom all in public or in private wor- " ſhip, whoſe taſte is grateful, and ever will be ſo, " 'till Nature herſelf ſhall change—no tint of " words can ſpot thy ſnowy mantle, or chymic " power turn thy ſceptre into iron—with thee to " ſmile upon him as he eats his cruſt, the Swain is " happier than his Monarch, from whoſe court thou " art exiled." Sterne wrote to the world, and mankind are compoſed of freemen and of ſlaves. But had he only addreſſed the wretch born to no inheritance but ſlavery without hope, he had uttered the language not of benevolence but of cruelty. The water which approaches, without touching, the parched lips of Tantalus, is the fabled malignity of Hell.—" In thirty years the weſtern breeze had not " once fanned his blood—he had ſeen no ſun, no " moon, in all that time—nor had the voice of " friend or kinſman breathed through his lattice." Go, though Champion of Iriſh *independent* Parliaments—go, and tell him of the refreſhing Zephyr, the genial light and heat, the ſoothing balm of Friendſhip and of Love!

THE END.